

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has misapplied the teachings of Swartwood in three ways: (1) Swartwood does not disclose a semi-cylindrical interlocking feature on either side of a knife; (2) the interlocking feature that is disclosed in Swartwood is on the front side of the knife and not the back side of the knife as claimed; and (3) the interlocking feature disclosed in Swartwood is shaped so that it does not permit the claimed rotation of the knife.

(1) The space between the two ridges on the front side 20 of Swartwood's knife is not of a semi-cylindrical form as stated by the Examiner, but rather is a flat region bounded by the two low ridges. In contrast, the interlocking feature 30 in the present application is fully semi-cylindrical in form. This is significant in that the semi-cylindrical shape of the interlocking feature in the present application is instrumental in allowing the rotational movement of the knife disclosed herein, whereas the flat shape of Swartwood's feature would not allow for rotational movement.

(2) The present application discloses a knife with a semi-cylindrical interlocking feature on the back side of the knife that interlocks with a clamping member to allow for rotation of the knife during engagement. The front and back sides of the knives both in Swartwood and in the present application are not arbitrary designations, but are functional distinctions well-known in the art based on the mode of operation of the apparatus using the knife. As the assembly holding the knife rotates, bringing the knife in contact with the article of wood, the front side of the knife is the side that is forward-facing in the rotational motion and initially makes contact with the

wood. Swartwood discloses a knife wherein the interlocking feature (for instance, as shown in Swartwood's Figure 1) which is cited by the Examiner as being on the back side of Swartwood's knife is actually on the front side of the knife, i.e., the side of the knife that is forward in the rotational motion of the wood chipping apparatus. Swartwood refers to this front side 20 as the "bottom surface," as the front side of the knife in the rotational movement of Swartwood's chipper is in a downward facing position when the knife makes contact with the wood that is being chipped. This bottom surface or front side 20 comprises two ridges, while the back side 18 (referred to by Swartwood as the "top surface") is without any feature whatsoever. It is this featureless back side of Swartwood's knife that corresponds with the back side 14 in the present application that possesses the semi-cylindrical interlocking feature 30. The knife of the present application also possesses ridges designated as 18a and 18b on the front side 12 of the knife, as shown in Figure 1A, these ridges being analogous to the ridges on the "bottom surface" in Swartwood referred to by the Examiner. Thus both sides of the knife in the present application have interlocking features, in contrast to the knife disclosed by Swartwood which lacks the semi-cylindrical interlocking feature on the back side.

(3) Swartwood's knife does not permit rotation of the knife relative to the clamping member 16. Clamping member 16 of Swartwood comprises two long grooves that receive the two ridges of Swartwood's knife, in effect preventing any rotational movement whatsoever. In contrast, Figure 3A of the present application shows a rounded tip on clamping member 32 that allows for rotational movement of the present knife even when still partially engaged with the semi-cylindrical interlocking feature.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 44, 45, 51, and 52 be withdrawn, which also serves to render moot the objections to the remaining claims.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,



Geoffrey K. Cooper
Reg. No. 51,266